

of the preamble. In Claims 1 – 4 the goal is to diagnose glaucoma. This is accomplished by determining if the person being tested abnormally expresses GR β . This is done broadly by detecting “aberrant alternate...(GR β) expression or defects...GR β .” Claim 1. Specific assays or methods for determining whether a person abnormally expresses GR β are set forth in Claim 2. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 – 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. See the explanation in the prior paragraph. In addition, the Examiner should understand, the claimed invention is not directed to a method for “treating glaucoma” (Office Action, page four, third paragraph), but to a method for diagnosing glaucoma.

Claims 1 – 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. As explained in the Declaration of Dr. Clark, many methods for analyzing DNA are known to those skilled in the art, including those specifically set forth in the specification on page 2. The invention is not directed to new methods for analyzing DNA, but for diagnosing glaucoma by testing persons for aberrant expression of GR β . Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments, remarks, and Declaration provided in this paper, Applicants’ claims are in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 12, 2001

By: Sally S. Leager
Sally S. Leager
Registration No. 32,757
(817) 551-4031

Address for Correspondence:



26356

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No.: 1581F US